

BUSINESS MEETING OF THE INDIANA GAMING COMMISSION

Transcript of the business meeting of the Indiana Gaming Commission held on August 14, 1998, in the auditorium of the Indiana Government Center South, 402 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, at 9:30 a.m.

BAYNES & SHIREY REPORTING SERVICE
BANK ONE CENTER/CIRCLE CENTER
111 MONUMENT CIRCLE
SUITE 582
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46204-5105
(317) 231-9004

1	
2	
3	
4	COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:
5	Donald Vowels, Chairman
6	Ann Bochnowski
7	Thomas Micarek
8	Robert Swan
9	Richard Darko
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Call to Order at 9:30 a.m.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Good morning, we'll call the meeting to order. We have all commissioners with the exception of Commissioner Sundwick and Commissioner Ross.

And as soon as I get a real microphone I'll be with you. Does this one work?

So therefore we have a quorum. So we'll call the meeting to order. And the first order on the agenda are the approval of the minutes from our telephone conference of July 27th, 1998. I believe we've all had an opportunity to review those minutes.

Does anyone have a motion in reference to those minutes?

COMMISSIONER MILCAREK: I would so motion.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: All right. Okay.

Motion to approve and a second. And all
those in favor say aye. (Group approved.)

Those are approved.

And then the report of the executive director, Mr. Thar. Share my microphone.

MR. THAR: Thank you, and good

morning. I'd like to start out with some personnel changes. I'd like to introduce our newest addition to the legal division, John Crouse. He has taken the position that was vacated by Deana Garner. John comes to us from the Criminal Justice Institute where he had a distinguishing employment and he now has a second distinguishing career achievement, that is, he is the first male attorney that's ever worked in our legal department. So anyway, we welcome John. And he's very capable. So thank you, John.

MR. CROUSE: Thank you.

MR. THAR: Major Richard Shelton of the Indiana State police who has been assigned to the gaming commission of the Indiana State police has announced his retirement. I believe his last day is -- is it next Thursday? Next Wednesday. Major Shelton couldn't be here today. He is on leave practicing for his retirement. But he did want everyone to know that it has been a pleasure working with the commission and with the staff and he has greatly enjoyed it, and we all wish him well in his

1 retirement.

Indiana Gaming Association has hired a new, if not its first, executive director. Her name is Ms. Jennifer Simmons, and we welcome her. Jennifer are you here? There. And the association represents the riverboats. And we wish Jennifer well in that endeavor.

With regard to the riverboats, folks, first on the Lake Michigan boats. Last week Floyd and I visited the five riverboats in northern Indiana to see some changes and some -- the proposed changes in the various vessel and operations. A brief rundown of what is going on would be as following: Empress has opened its fourth deck. The deck that was open is now enclosed. They have turned it into an additional gaming area. They have also isolated space for a poker room which they intend to open once the staff has finished going over and finally approving their internal controls for poker.

As you're all aware Showboat has been purchased by Harrah's. And at some point in

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

time that property will be renamed a

Harrah's property. So we've been led to

believe. Most likely after the first of the

year. The new general manager is an

individual by the name of John Diminico -
Joe Diminico, I'm sorry, who comes from

Harrah's Atlantic City property.

Trump has also finished off its

fourth deck that used to be open, and they
use it -- and it's been completed for some
time. They use it primarily for promotional
events. Also their hotel construction is
progressing nicely. And they began -- they
intend to begin opening the hotel this fall
in phases.

Majestic Star has opened its poker room. There are now two boats up on the lake which offer poker.

With regard to Blue Chip, Blue Chip has provided the commission with copies of some renderings with regard to their hotel construction. They intend to break ground this fall. And have it completed within a year. Those renderings will be available for anyone in the public that wishes to view

1 |

those also.

With regard to the Ohio riverboat.

Aztar provided us with some information
that, as to what they were doing for
responsible gaming education week, which was
the week of August 3 through 7.

Grand Victory has a new general manager. His name is John Spina. And Argosy just seems to be moving along setting new highs each month with the amount of revenues they're generating from people who are visiting.

license. As you are all aware Casino

America advised the commission on Monday

that they regretfully determined that the

numbers and some other items did not justify

their continuing as an applicant in Crawford

County. They were very grateful for the

help received from the citizens of both

Levenworth and Crawford County and would

some day still like to do business in

Indiana. This is, of course, an agenda item

that will receive more attention later.

Finally, to again bring up part of

what was discussed in the executive session this morning. We have been advised by IGT, International Game Technology, that was a licensed supplier of electronic gaming devices in this jurisdiction, that they had uncovered through an internal investigation some problems that occurred for an 18-month period during 1992 and 1993.

Those problems involved their
European affiliate and the use of false
invoices in shipping machines, and in one
instance, parts to the country of Turkey.
At the time Turkey had a very high tax on
import, particularly gaming machines, and
the false invoices were utilized to help
defeat that tax.

When, in 1993 the report goes on to explain, the person in the shipping department reported that he believed that there were irregularities in these invoices and accused the person who was running the operation of doing that. The company did an internal investigation. The person who blew the whistle was one deemed to not have much credibility in the company; the one who he

blew the whistle against was highly
regarded. The general counsel at the time
issued some very explicit directives, that
this was illegal activity, this could not be
occurring, should not be occurring, must
stop if it ever has, but the investigation
didn't go too far.

Subsequently, IGT began it's own investigation within the last 12 months and uncovered that this has occurred and then has advised the Indiana Gaming Commission, as well as the other jurisdictions they do business with.

The person who was in the shipping department is no longer with IGT, as well as the person who ran the operation in Europe at the time and the person responsible are both gone. From the staff point of view in reviewing it, there is no one in the company now that was directly involved in that type of activity. It is clearly illegal. We did not discover it in our background investigation, nor did any other jurisdiction. IGT has self reported it and the question is what more, if anything, does

1 this commission desire to look into with 2 regard to IGT. Staff's recommendation is we 3 are going to order the full report and take 4 a look at it. But based upon the facts as 5 we know them now, our recommendation would 6 be that no further action be taken because 7 it appears they have cleaned house 8 themselves on something that happened the 9 better part of five years ago. 10 Any discussion on that? 11 Anyone have any CHAIRMAN VOWELS: 12 questions for Mr. Thar? 13 I would recommend that we follow 14 Mr. Thar's suggestion. Anybody have any 15 opposition to that? I believe we can give

you the go ahead then.

MR. THAR: That would conclude my report. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any questions for Mr. Thar? All right.

Anything under the old business category?

MR. THAR: No, not that we're aware of.

> Okay. Then under CHAIRMAN VOWELS:

23

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

new business the first matter on the agenda is occupational license matters/disciplinary actions. And that would bring us to Ms. Fleming.

MS. FLEMING: Thank you. The first five that we will be dealing with all arose out of the arrests in East Chicago of some dealers who were at a location on Columbus Drive and were rest arrested for visiting or maintaining a common nuisance. We revoked several licenses out of that action and five of those individuals appealed.

The hearing was held before the

Administrative Law Judge Bernard Pilot on

June 17th and he has filed his recommended

findings of fact, conclusions of law and his
recommendation.

With respect to Robert Rigoni, the administrative law judge has recommended that his license be reinstated on a probationary basis for a period of six months subject to any conditions or restrictions the commission deems appropriate. The commission staff would recommend that during that six-month period

Mr. Rigoni be restricted from gaming on any of the vessels in Indiana, and that a monetary fine not to exceed \$250 be imposed, and that that be paid within a period of three months.

With respect to Jeannie David, the administrative law judge has recommended that her license be reinstated and be placed on a probationary status for a period of one year, pursuant to conditions the commission deems appropriate. The staff would recommend that she also be ordered not to game on any Indiana vessels and that she pay a fine not to exceed \$500 within the first six months of her probationary period.

With respect to Shane Brogan, the administrative law judge has recommended that his license be reinstated on a probationary status for a period of one year, and that subject to the conditions the commission deems appropriate, the staff would recommend that he be ordered not to game on Indiana vessels, and that he be fined, not to exceed \$500, be imposed to be paid within the first six months of

probation.

Wit
various ot
during the
judge has
his tempor
denial of
license be
would not

With respect to Jason Gentry, due to various other suitability issues that arose during the hearing the administrative law judge has recommended that the revocation of his temporary occupational license and the denial of his application for a permanent license be upheld. Therefore, Mr. Gentry would not be able to be licensed in the State of Indiana if the administrative law judge's recommendation is accepted.

With respect to Cynthia Langley on her again failure to disclose certain items on her application and some items that arose during the hearing, the administrative law judge has recommended that her occupational license be -- her revocation of her temporary occupational license and the denial of her application for a permanent license be upheld. If the recommendation is accepted, she will not be licensed in the State of Indiana.

With respect to those five are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Anybody have any

_ _

questions for Ms. Fleming? Doesn't appear to be.

How about if we go ahead and take action on -- Ms. Fleming, we go ahead and take action on these before we get to the next set?

MS. FLEMING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay. All right.

Let's look at these. The first one, in the order that she presented those, is Robert Rigoni. The recommendation is probationary status for a period of six months. And the conditions, or restrictions requested, are self eviction, which is essentially no gaming on an Indiana boat. And if that's violated, that would subject that person to a criminal prosecution for trespass. And under Mr. Rigoni, the request is a fine up to \$250, payable within three months.

So we need to make a decision whether to -- and you see on Page 2 there the following actions, the six different variations that we can do here. One thing specifically, if we decide to adopt the recommendation, then we've got to decide

what type of fine, and the request is not to exceed \$250. Anyone have any thoughts on

I move to accept the recommendation and set the fine at \$100. CHAIRMAN VOWELS: All right. Any

Second.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further discussion? All in favor say aye.

Show Mr. Rigoni's fine as \$100, payable within three months, self eviction and a probationary status for six months.

The next was Jeannie David's appeal. The request -- the recommendation of the staff, or the ALJ recommendation is probationary status for one year subject to the conditions, and those conditions are self eviction, no gaming on an Indiana boat. Fine up to \$500, payable within six months. Any discussion there? Any motions?

COMMISSIONER MILCAREK: Well, I make a motion to accept the recommendation, and impose a \$250 fine.

	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any second to that
2	motion?
3	COMMISSIONER SWAN: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further
5	discussion? All in favor say aye.
6	(MOTION PASSED)
7	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: \$250 fine.
8	And Shane Brogan is the next. That's
9	a recommendation by the ALJ of a
10	probationary status for a period of up to
11	one year with a restriction of self
12	eviction. Fine up to \$500, payable in six
13	months. We have all of the options there on
14	Page 2.
15	Does anyone have a motion in
16	reference to one of those options?
17	COMMISSIONER DARKO: I'll move to
18	adopt the ALJ's recommendation.
19	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: And in reference to
20	the fine?
21	COMMISSIONER DARKO: 500.
22	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any second?
23	COMMISSIONER SWAN: Can I discuss
24	that?
25	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay.

1	COMMICCIONED CWAN THE STATE OF
1	COMMISSIONER SWAN: Just a matter of
2	clarification. We had \$250 on the last one,
3	why would we make this one 500?
4	COMMISSIONER DARKO: Were these two
5	people who were both visiting?
6	MS. FLEMING: Yes.
7	COMMISSIONER DARKO: Let me change my
8	recommendation to \$250.
9	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: With that motion is
10	there a second?
11	COMMISSIONER SWAN: I'll second it.
12	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further
13	discussion? All in favor say aye.
14	(MOTION PASSED)
15	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Show a probationary
16	status of one year, self eviction condition,
17	fine of \$250 payable in six months.
18	And then the next is Jason Gentry.
19	The recommendation there is the revocation
20	of the temporary occupational license and
21	denial of Mr. Gentry's application for a
22	permanent occupational license. Is there
23	any discussion in reference to that? Is
24	there any motion?
25	COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: I move that

2	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Is there a second?
3	COMMISSIONER SWAN: Second.
4	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further
5	discussion? All those in favor say aye.
6	(MOTION PASSED.)
7	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Show his
8	application is denied.
9	And then, in reference to Cynthia
10	Langley's recommendation by the ALJ, they
11	recommended a denial of her application for
12	permanent occupational license. The
13	revocation is a temporary. Is there any
14	discussion in reference to that? Is there
15	any motion?
16	COMMISSIONER SWAN: Move to accept
17	the ALJ's recommendation.
18	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any second?
19	COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: I'll second
20	it.
21	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further
22	discussion? All those in favor say aye.
23	(MOTION PASSED.)
24	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Ms. Fleming, I
25	guess that was all clear to you as far as

we accept the ALJ's recommendation.

MS. FLEMING: Yes.

2

CHAIRMAN VOWELS:

All right.

The next one is Johnny MS. FLEMING: Mr. Rodriquez' license was revoked due to the fact that he and another individual who was also part of the marine crew working at Showboat were moving the chairs from slot machines and after the drop process, going through with wire hangers and trying to scoop any loose tokens from under the slot machines. Their actions to testify secured in surveillance, we revoked the license. Mr. Rodriguez appealed the discussion.

Bernard Pilot was again was appointed the administrative law judge. Mr. Rodriguez did not appear at his hearing and the commission went forth and presented the evidence that they had. The administrative lay judge has recommended that Mr. Rodriguez' license, the revocation of his temporary occupational license and the denial for his application for a permanent license be upheld. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Does anyone have

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 any questions? Essentially, a default 2 against him at the ALJ hearing. All right. 3 In reference to the recommendation, the 4 ALJ's recommendation is that the 5 occupational license, application for the permanent license be denied. And of course 6 7 the revocation of the temporary. 8 Is there any discussion in reference 9 to that then? Is there any motion? 10 MR. MILCAREK: I would motion to 11 accept the recommendation. 12 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any second? 13 COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: I'll second 14 it. 15 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye. 16 17 (MOTION PASSED.) 18 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Ms. Fleming, got 19 something? 20 MS. FLEMING: The next two I will 21 deal with together. This is Matthew Warner 22 and Lisa Negro. These two individuals are 23 both licensed as poker dealers at the 24 Showboat Mardi Gras Casino. They were on 25 May 28th playing poker at the Hollywood

Casino in Aurora, Illinois. They were detected by surveillance, and this is on video that they were exchanging signals underneath the poker table indicating to the other if one had a good hand. Based on that information, the other would then decide whether or not to fold his or her hand.

Once we received that information, reviewed it, the commission staff has revoked their temporary licenses and denied their application for a permanent license. The commission will then need to vote to approve or deny the action of the commission staff. If you do uphold the revocation, their temporary license and the denial of their permanent license, each will have the opportunity to appeal that matter to an administrative law judge. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any questions of Ms. Fleming then? Do you want to take both of these together?

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: Same issue.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: About as close as it could be. All right. Any discussion,

1 any motion in reference to these two 2 requests for denial? 3 COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: I move -- I never quite know how to word this. 4 I move 5 that we accept the action of the commission 6 staff in denying their permanent 7 applications and revoking their temporary 8 licenses. 9 How do I need to say this? I'll say 10 it. 11 MS. FLEMING: Denies the application. 12 COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: We deny the 13 application. Sometimes it's approve your action. 14 15 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: In other words, do 16 whatever Kay wants. 17 COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: Exactly. 18 MS. FLEMING: I don't have a problem 19 with that. 20 COMMISSIONER MILCAREK: I will second 21 that. 22 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: To do whatever Kay 23 wants? 24 Actually we have a motion and a 25 second to deny the application and revoke

22

23

24

25

the temporary license of both Mr. Warner and Ms. Negro. And any further discussion on that? All those in favor say aye.

(MOTION PASSED.)

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: All right. And Ms. Fleming, anything else for us?

MS. FLEMING: The next matter is Ronald Jacobson. This was a disciplinary action that was initiated by the commission against this licensee. Mr. Jacobson is a dealer at the Majestic Star. He was on board the Blue Chip Casino, got into an altercation with another passenger and ended up striking that passenger twice. commission staff initiated the disciplinary action against him, entered into settlement of brief negotiations with him and have a signed agreement with him that Mr. Jacobson will be placed on state's exclusion list for a period of one year, which means that he cannot gamble in the State of Indiana for that period of time. The commission will need to vote to approve or disprove the proposed terms of the settlement agreement. Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any questions? All right. Do I hear a motion in approving those terms of the settlement agreement; approving or disapproving?

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: This time I move to approve the settlement agreement.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DARKO: Second.

Show it's approved.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further discussion? All in favor of that motion say aye.

(MOTION PASSED.)

CHAIRMAN VOWELS:

And, Ms. Fleming, anything further?

MS. FLEMING: Yes. The next matter
is Nelson Tinsely. Mr. Tinsely had a felony
conviction. He was working at the Trump
Casino. Once -- he did reveal on his
application the conviction, but it was not
indicated whether or not that was a felony
conviction. During the course of the
background investigation, due to the length
of time of the sentence and pulling the
docket sheets, we determined that was a
felony. We revoked his license because he

was statutorily not eligible to hold a license. He applied for a waiver of the felony conviction. However, it is a felony conviction in violation of a federal law, therefore rendering him statutorily ineligible for life.

In addition, the conviction was for insurance or mail fraud. The statute also bars the issuance of a felony waiver.

Anyone convicted of a felony confronting fraud, deceit or misrepresentation. As a result the commission staff advised

Mr. Tinsely that he was statutorily ineligible.

He appealed that decision to an administrative law judge and the commission moved for summary judgment. The administrative law judge has filed a recommendation that the summary judgment be granted in favor of the commission due to the fact that Mr. Tinsely is statutorily ineligible to receive a waiver due to his felony disqualifications.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: All right. Any questions for Ms. Fleming?

As we all understand, we wouldn't have the discretion, even if we wish to, with the statute to allow Mr. Tinsely to have what he would request anyway. With all of that in mind, is there a motion to uphold the revocation of the temporary occupational license and deny application for permanent?

COMMISSIONER MILCAREK: Motion.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: To accept the ALJ's recommendation?

COMMISSIONER MILCAREK: Accept.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: Second it.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further

discussion? All those in favor say aye.

(MOTION PASSED.)

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Ms. Fleming, do you have anything else?

MS. FLEMING: Yes, one more. This is a disciplinary action that the commission initiated against Trump Casino. There were three counts covered in the disciplinary action, all relating to problems with their internal control procedures. After the complaint was filed the commission did enter

2 3 4 5 6 7 10 the settlement agreement. 11 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: 12 13 14 15 16 17 we approve. CHAIRMAN VOWELS: 18 COMMISSIONER SWAN: Second. 19 20 21 discussion? All those in favor say aye. (MOTION PASSED.) 22 23 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: 24 25

into settlement negotiations with Trump Casino and have agreed with Trump that Trump will pay a fine in the amount of eight thousand dollars for each count for a total amount of \$24,000. Both the commission, by Mr. Thar, and Trump, by Mr. Demote, to have signed that settlement agreement. The action is now before the commission to approve or disapprove the proposed terms of

Okay. Any questions then for Ms. Fleming? All right.

We have before us this, to approve or disapprove the terms of the settlement agreement. Does anyone have a motion?

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: I move that

Any second?

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further

Ms. Fleming, in our packet is in reference to the administrative law judge down south. Do you need to make

any statement in regard to that? Or do we need to do anything here about that?

MS. FLEMING: No. It's just that
Robert Dodson -- or Jeff Dodson -- Robert
Jeff Dodson from Evansville had been
previously appointed as an administrative
law judge to handle hearings in the southern
part of state. The document of his
appointment has been misplaced. This makes
it retroactive to the date that his contract
was signed. We have had a contract with
Mr. Dodson for some time. We just need the
additional signatures making it retroactive
to 12/06/96.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay. And everyone understands that? There's no problem with Mr. Milcarek and myself signing off on that document.

Okay. And that leads us to the occupational license matter, disciplinary actions -- and thank you, Ms. Fleming.

Supplier license issues, that take us to Mr. Hannon.

MR HANNON: There are two companies for, on the docket for temporary license,

24

25

one is PDS Financial Corporation. Financial Corporation is a publicly traded corporation with 33 percent of the stock controlled by Johann Findley and his wife who are also the president and treasurer of the company. The company has its offices in Minnesota but is moving to Las Vegas within this year. The company provides financing for electronic gaming devices; they also operate a slot business by taking in used machines and reselling them after some We will limit modification and maintenance. the license to include the ability to finance machines and the ability to obtain slot machines, but only to transport them to states where PDS Financial is licensed to This will not allow them to possess them. purchase used slots and send them directly to another market.

The company and key persons are licensed in five jurisdictions. The staff recommend the company be awarded a temporary suppliers license pending the completion of a full investigation.

The second one is Advanced Casino

Systems Corporation. This is a subsidiary of the Great Bay Casino Corporation operating out of Ann Arbor, New Jersey. The company has developed casino slot and marketing system software. The company's system has been used by Caesar's and is currently in use in three casinos owned by the parent company and 57 other casinos around the world.

The ACSC, or the Advanced Casino
Systems Corporation, is publicly traded.
The parent company has 17 subsidiaries and
is currently reorganizing due to bankruptcy
that affects several of those subsidiaries.
Ultimately Advanced Casino System
Corporation will become the sole subsidiary
of Great Bay Casino Corporation. And will
in turn become a subsidiary of Hollywood
Casino Corporation. Currently there is very
limited adverse financial exposure to
Advance Casino Corporation due to the
bankruptcy. The reorganization will not
affect the ownership or key persons that are
in place now.

The company is licensed to do

business in four other jurisdictions and does business in several others that do not require this type of a company to be licensed. The staff recommends the company be awarded a temporary license pending a complete investigation that would include the following, the bankruptcy action.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: All right. Any questions for Mr. Hannon?

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: Is it your feeling that even if this bankruptcy occurs, worst case scenario the company ceases to exist, do you think that by our licensing them and allowing them to do business in Indiana, would that adversely affect our operations?

MR HANNON: No, they just provide the software for the equipment. And the company's exposure is probably less than \$200,000 due to that bankruptcy.

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any other questions?

We have in front of us resolution 1998-21, which is a resolution granting the

temporary suppliers license to Advanced
Casino Systems Corp. and PDS Financial Corp.
The recommendations of the staff is that we
grant those temporary suppliers license. Is
there a motion one way or the other in
reference to resolution 1998-21?

COMMISSIONER DARKO: Move to adopt the recommendation.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any second?

COMMISSIONER MILCAREK: I'll second
it.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further discussion? All those in favor to adopt the resolution 1998-21 say aye.

(MOTION PASSED.)

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: And Mr. Hannon, anything?

MR HANNON: Yes. For the first time we have five companies up for renewal of their permanent suppliers license, that being GEMACO Playing Card Company, Mikohn Gaming Corporation, Paul-Son Gaming Supplies, Bud Jones Company and Osborn Coinage Company. These are five companies that have held licenses for one year and are

1 due for renewal. None of the companies have 2 been subject to any disciplinary action by the commission and all have paid renewal 3 Under our rules we will do a complete 4 fees. 5 reinvestigation every three years. 6 companies -- well, for this first one we'll 7 renew their license permanently on August 19 of 1997. 8 9 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: All right. Any 10 questions for Mr. Hannon? We have a resolution 1998-22, which 11 concerns renewal of the suppliers license of 12 13 these five companies that we have there in 14 front of us. Any motion in reference to 15 that resolution? 16 COMMISSIONER SWAN: Move to approve. 17 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any second? 18 COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: Second it. 19 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any further All right, all those in favor 20 discussion? of approving resolution 1998-22 say aye. 21 22 (MOTION PASSED.) 23 Mr. Hannon, that does it for you. 24 MR HANNON: That's it. 25 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: All right.

item on the agenda is the fifth Ohio River license. There will be a hearing on September 14th, or a commission meeting on September 14th, where we will deal with that.

Mr. Thar, has there been any thought given as to any presentation at that time, or do you have any suggestions of how that will proceed?

MR. THAR: Yes. The -- obviously
Sun's Casino America has withdrawn and takes
us back to the situation I believe we had in
May when we set the September 14th date. An
that was that we were going to request that
the applicant and the county to give us a
brief update to refresh us as to what the
project involved, advise us of any changes
in the project or any changes that the
county may have made with regard to their
revenue sharing.

Both the county and the company have advised us of the changes that they have made. The county has advised us that they have increased the amount of revenue sharing that they intend to do with Crawford County,

7

8

9

6

10

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

23

24

25

should Switzerland County get the license, by approximately one half million dollars, which would bring, I think, the total to approximately one million dollars of revenue sharing which Switzerland County would do with Crawford County should Switzerland County get the license.

In addition I was advised in a fax yesterday from Hollywood Boomtown, that they in addition to participating in that increase of revenue sharing to Crawford County is also going to increase the percentage that it's going to share with Switzerland County, that is, the voluntary contribution that Hollywood Boomtown intends to make above that which is required by statute. In one instance it would be approximately .425 percent. And then depending on how business goes, it could go up as high as, I think, it's either .8 or .85 percent. 85 -- thank you, Jerry. So almost another full percent that the company is going to pass on to Switzerland County. And Switzerland County will then in turn have the ability to do with that money what

1 they choose to.

I have advised the applicant in the county that today the commission would decide what type of presentation it would like, so that they would have approximately a month to get it together. Staff's recommendation would be that we keep it, not as flamboyant as some of the ones have been in the past, I don't think there's a need for movies, or any of that type of stuff.

Our recommendation would be we ask
the applicant to be prepared to explain to
us in 20 minutes or less the changes in
their project and, the change in the look of
their project which they have filed with us,
and also give the county five to ten minutes
to explain to us any changes that they have
in their revenue sharing. And then proceed
from there.

At this time, there is no other applicant. And I do see that there are people from Crawford County here. I don't know if they wish to address the commission at all on this issue. Mr. Chairman, Doug Floyd has indicated he would like to address

2.2

the commission.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay, why don't we allow Mr. Floyd to do that now, and then we'll make a decision on what the presentation time will be on September 14th.

Mr. Floyd. If you'll state your name for the recorder, please.

MR. FLOYD: My name is Doug Floyd. I'm counsel to Crawford County Casino Corporation. My purpose in addressing you this morning is to first thank you at your last meeting and telephone conference, you allowed a 30-day extension of time for amendments to the application in Crawford It gave us the opportunity to explore with Casino America a substantially revised project. Unfortunately they made a decision that they could not proceed with a considerably scaled down version, and have something that they believed would be successful or attractive from the commission's point of view.

Since that telephone conference, and your giving us that opportunity, we have no further amendments at this date to the

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

1 application. And, as you know, the application amendment deadline passed yesterday.

> Secondly, I want to let the commission know that we are, even though the deadline has expired, we are actively pursuing gaming operators. I think you may have reached some sort of milestone here. Crawford County Casino Corporation may be your first applicant that is not a gaming company, at least all of its stock is held by a company that is not a gaming company.

I want to get those details before you, because I'm not sure they were clearly expressed during your telephone conference. Horseshoe Bend, LLC is an Indiana entity that has been created to hold the license. But if you remember, Crawford County Casino Corporation, your applicant, was an Indiana corporation created by Casino Magic. Magic has, since your telephone conference, transferred all of the stock of that entity to Horseshoe Bend, LLC.

Horseshoe Bend, LLC consists of members who are citizens of Crawford County,

24

25

2

3

4

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and volunteers to take advantage of whatever opportunity there is in the county to pursue the application filed with Crawford County Casino Corporation. It is Horseshoe Bend LLC who is pursuing other gaming companies.

The time between now and your September hearing will be used by us to hopefully find an operator that makes some And we will apprise you of sense to you. any opportunities that we have as soon as those opportunities present themselves. In the meantime, we believe we still have, not only a good site for your consideration, and an opportunity for an alternative for your decision-making process, but we also believe that we have a group of people in Crawford County who, with some considerable hard work and dedication, that are deserving of whatever opportunity there remains. glad that there are 30 more days. learned anything I guess it is that time's an eternity in this business.

I remember auditoriums like this in Gary, Evansville, over the last few years where I've seen a lot of surprises and

changes. We will not present you with any surprises. We will afford you all information through your staff of any changes that we are aware of. But we did want you to understand this morning what the current status is, and we thank you for the opportunity you've given us to this point. We hope we can return with some new opportunity for you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Thank you,

Mr. Floyd. So that would lead us, the

commissioners to the discussion of whether

this process remains open to a possible

other gaming company coming into Crawford

County. Any thoughts on that?

commissioner Bochnowski: Well, I would think that the way it would have to come, another gaming company, the only way it could come in at this point would be as a lender in the sense that, the same way we've seen that before. And then it would still be the same applicant. It couldn't be an actual -- a gaming company could not be a applicant at this point.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Well, there has to

be a vessel and people to work on the vessel and people to be the key employees of the vessel. What I see is part of the problem is what Mr. Hannon would have to go through as far as investigation. Do any of the rest of you have any thoughts on that?

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: Well, that, employees wouldn't be a problem so much, because that always comes later. I mean, it could only be the same applicants that we have on file now, but we have accepted gaming companies coming in as, not as an applicant but as a source of financing.

Α Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: That Okay. would be the only way I could see that this would work.

I think we have to look at MR. THAR: this a little bit more realistically, and that is, there really isn't an applicant. We have an application. We have an application that shows Casino Magic as the gaming company that is going to put forth a particular project with these particular numbers in this particular dollar amount.

FORM CSR - LASER REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO.

With these types of people.

In order for the staff or this commission to make any sense out of any kind of presentation there would have to be amendments to that application by someone that would say, this is what the project's going to be, this is where the money's coming from, this is how much it's going to cost. The deadline for that has passed.

If I understood you correctly, Doug, while Crawford County Casino Corporation would and intends to pursue other gaming companies to step in and maybe back up the application, there is no gaming company as we sit here today?

MR. FLOYD: That is accurate.

MR. THAR: Yeah. Which has kind of been the situation for the last 12 months or more. With the on-again off-again role of Casino Magic as well as the in and out of Harrah's, so to speak.

So the question becomes, is the commission going to allow a gaming company to step in sometime between now and September 14th? And as tough a decision as

it is, I would suggest that the answer should be no. It's been a long time.

Crawford County's had the ability to go out and look for an applicant. And in truth you can't put it together in 30 days. At least can't even amend an application, I don't think in 30 days, and do it well. And I don't want to be one to dash hopes, but I am one who kind of wants to look at realities in a situation.

I don't see it coming together. Why pretend that it would, I guess. So that's one person's thoughts. Doug, if you have some response to that, please.

MR. FLOYD: No, I think those are -well, first a fair observation. The 12
months while both Harrah's and Casino
America have expressed some interest in the
opportunity that we have in the county. I
do see no particular reason why the
commission needs to place a finality today
when there is another hearing scheduled in
September anyway.

As I observed a while ago, things have changed considerably for you all

21

22

23

24

25

And I don't know if a, an agreement presented to you at your September meeting or submitted to the staff between now and the September meeting, that an operating company wished to undertake an operation up in Crawford County license through a management agreement as opposed to ownership of Crawford County Casino Corporation would be something that you might perceive as feasible. But we have invited gaming companies, since Tuesday, when we received the Casino America letter, to provide us their thoughts on the fact that we now own the Crawford County Casino Corporation license and we would like to submit a proposal.

We have not received responses to the request that we put out on Tuesday. If rather than closing the door on whatever response those might bring, you simply take no action today, that does not put you in, I think, any disadvantaged position. Come September 14th, it does leave the door open for some change, whatever this might be.

I don't disagree with Jack. I'm not

trying to be unrealistic telling you we are doing our level best. And we think for the benefit of the state there's no reason to shut the opportunity for our efforts to deliver something that's beneficial to you.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: When did the referendum pass there in Crawford County?

MR. FLOYD: In '94. '94, '95. It was '94.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: November of '94?

MR. FLOYD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DARKO: John, I think
this discussion has been helpful. But when
you get down to it we're not being asked to
do anything, so let's not do anything.

Let's go ahead on the 14th, based upon what
we know today, which is that there's one
applicant. We'll expect a complete but
abbreviated presentation from that
applicant. If things change between now and
then and somebody asks us to do something,
we can deal with it then.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Any thoughts on that?

MR. THAR: No, that's a fair way to

approach it.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay. I don't know that we really need to do anything other than to have the staff keep us apprised if something comes up then.

MR. FLOYD: Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay. Okay. As it stands right now, there is one application that we have in front of us, which is the Switzerland County application. Assuming that's what we will have on September 14th, we need to make some sort of definitive decision about how the presentation will be handled. Most of us have been through this numerous times, and the State has got their \$50 a day out of us in a lot of those hearings where we have sat there for eight or nine hours.

The bottom line is we have seen all the dog and pony shows and bells and whistles that any commission would ever have to see. I think from what Mr. Thar suggested of a 20-minute presentation, which would basically be a summary and an update

2.2

from the applicant in Switzerland County, along with an additional five to ten minutes from Switzerland County official or officials to update us on what their thoughts, or the incentives that they are to receive. I think that 20-minute summary and the additional five to ten minutes for the county officials, or the city officials, whatever, however they want to designate it to us, would really be all that we would need. Does anybody else have anything to say about that?

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: You're saying 20 minutes for the company and then --

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Another five or ten minutes, whatever the staff would deem necessary, for then to be able to tell us what they need to tell us. But it would just be a meat and potatoes meeting.

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: It would end up being about a half hour.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Presentation. Of course, questions could be asked. We can drag that out as long as we want. So,

of time.

MR. THAR: I do. I've discussed it, kind of those time limits with the company and with the county and they seem to be agreeable with that. Obviously, that would not have been the suggestion of the discussion if there was an applicant that was asking for an hour to give a presentation, the other applicant would have asked for the same amount of time. But the way things looks right now both the county

and the company are unhappy with those types

Mr. Thar, you think that's fair enough?

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay. And as I've said, I mean if the company people sit here and listen, you, this is the tenth license -- or the ninth license -- no, the tenth license, and you know what we need to hear. It is meat and potatoes at this point in time. And you don't have to go through much in the way of fluff. We just want to know the numbers and how they're crunching and what the reality of the anticipated projections are.

So with that in mind, it will be a

I would be

25

1 meat and potatoes hearing on that day. 2 COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: 3 real interested to make sure that the 4 5 6 7 they're going to do. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: 10 11 12 monologues. 13 14 15 16 17 MR. THAR: 18 19 COMMISSIONER DARKO: 20 21 22 23 minimum of 4.25 percent. 24 MR. THAR: .4.

applicant, you know, has the financing in place, has everything ready to go, financially capable of doing what they say COMMISSIONER SWAN: And we have the people here so we can get yes or no answers. Right. COMMISSIONER SWAN: And not long CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay. Anything further in reference to that? I see we have Floyd Coats on the agenda. Before we get to Mr. Coats is there anything further? Not on this issue. There may be something after Mr. Coats. I was going to ask one question about Mr. Thar's indication of Hollywood Boomtown had increased its revenue sharing to Switzerland County at a

COMMISSIONER DARKO: That money is at

the discretion of Switzerland County at this

1

2 point? 3 MR. THAR: Yes. 4 COMMISSIONER DARKO: So some of that 5 could be used for additional revenue sharing 6 to some of the other counties, Ripley, 7 Jeffersonville and Crawford County. 8 MR. THAR: If Switzerland County 9 chose to. Yeah. COMMISSIONER DARKO: It would be 10 helpful for me to know at the time of the 11 hearing what Switzerland County intending to 12 do with that new money that's been 13 available. 14 15 MR. THAR: Since they just got the 16 fax yesterday also, my guess is they haven't 17 had time to think about it. 18 COMMISSIONER DARKO: They're still 19 counting it. Thank you. Okay. If there's 20 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: nothing further then, I believe Floyd Coats 21 is here. A gentleman that would like to 22 23 address the commission. Mr. Coats. 24 MR. THAR: Mr. Coats had also 25 indicated there were a couple of other

Α

people that may want to address the commission also. But I'll leave that up to, Mr. Vowels. Mr. Chairman, that's your call.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: We'll see how long Mr. Coats goes here and then we'll figure that out from there.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Commission, I want to lead off by saying please do not award anymore boat licenses. We don't need it. We don't want it. And we've got to find, we've got to allow the governor's commission time to determine and to tell us what the real impact has been of riverboat gambling.

I'm Floyd Coats, Chairman of the
Citizens Against Gambling Expansion. As
father, grandfather and church going
citizen, I'm concerned about the failing
morality in America. And right here in
Indiana. As a child, children were taught
the timeless principles of hard work,
frugality and perseverance. Now folks are
pinning their hopes on winning the lottery
or hitting a big one in one of Indiana's new
riverboat casinos. The message being sent

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to our young people is clear. You don't have to work hard to strike it rich, all you have to do is be lucky. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Indiana legislature voted to remove the State's defensive barrier to riverboat gambling forcing each Ohio River County to muster its own defense against the overwhelmingly well funded, well organized campaigns of out of state casino corporations. In Switzerland County, the opponents in that quiet rural area spent under \$100 while the out of state supporters of gambling investigated about \$50,000 in that campaign. The issue passed by 167 The gambling interests spent approximately \$18 and twenty cents per vote That was overwhelming, and unfair. cast. 31 percent of the registered voters in that county voted to approve gambling.

Switzerland County currently has an employment rate of only four percent. It does not need an additional employer. I was grateful for the folks who worked so hard in Jefferson County to defeat the gambling

referendum. They did the right thing.

61 percent of the Jefferson County citizens

voted against the boat. We do not want a

riverboat casino parked within a few short

minutes of most of the Jefferson County

residents.

I have here petitions, signed by some 800 people in just the last few days. petition reads as follows: Whereas the law does not require the Indiana gaming commission to award the fifth riverboat license, whereas there are already four casino riverboats on the Ohio River bordering Indiana. Whereas two-thirds of Indiana's out of Jefferson County residents voted overwhelmingly against riverboat casinos, it is unfair to put a boat within a few minutes of our county. Whereas there is growing evidence that gambling is having a negative effect on families and crime, a license in Switzerland County will have a negative impact on the quality of life in Switzerland and Jefferson Counties. Therefore, the citizens against gambling expansion hereby request that the Indiana

23 24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

gaming commission make the decision not to award anymore riverboat licenses on the Ohio river.

I have also here, a letter from Mr. Schultz, Chairman of Indiana, Southern Indiana Citizens Against Gambling. And it reads in part: Clark and Floyd County citizens have twice defeated the riverboat casino's efforts to locate their gambling expansion in their counties. Harrison County citizens passed the legislation -- the referendum -- by only a slim margin, 200 votes. It is very clear that the vast majority of citizens in this part of southern Indiana do not want riverboat gambling.

We think it is not good government policy to locate a riverboat gambling enterprise adjacent to counties who have expressed such overwhelming opposition to those enterprises. The net effect of riverboat gambling in Indiana has never been determined. The current gambling study on the national scope and the current gambling study proposed by the governor must be

completed and analyzed before we put another boat on the river. The current legal challenges to the Indiana 1993 gambling law casts very significant doubt on the future longevity of riverboat gambling in Indiana. We urge you not to award the fifth license. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Thank you,

Mr. Coats. I think we'll stick strictly to
the agenda. Mr. Coats was listed on the
agenda. So we won't be hearing from anyone
else here today. If you would like to
submit those petitions, I'll see that all
the other commissioners receive their
copies. Thank you.

Then the next matter on the agenda is Other Business.

MR. THAR: Before we get to other business, with regard to the fifth license, probably one would anticipate that we're going to get requests to address the commission at the September 14th meeting that for one reason or another the commission should not give out that license. What's the commission's pleasure on that?

22

23

24

25

1

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: It's -- I mean my thoughts on it are, you know, I'm not interested in that at that point. We're going to decide on September 14th whether that applicant in Switzerland County's going to get a license or not. And, like I said, it's going to be a meat and potatoes hearing. And I'm not interested in hearing the opposition to that. We've heard from Switzerland County, we were there in Vevay and heard from the citizens there. we've had numerous hearings on this, and we're aware that there's opposition within that county. Just as Mr. Coats' outlined, there's at least 800 people in petitions here.

I'll do whatever the other commissioners would like to do, but my thought is no, let's get down to it.

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: Well, I
think we're pretty aware of the arguments
against another license or gambling in
general. And I wouldn't be opposed to
reading any letters that might come in, you
know, I'm happy to read them. I think we've

heard a lot of these arguments and they're intelligent arguments and they're well founded. And we take them seriously.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: And those letters always get forwarded to us. I've read every one that's ever been sent.

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: I have too.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: And it's a lot more interesting than the things I normally read during the course of the day, so I look forward to them.

Anybody else have any thoughts?

MR. THAR: Then the staff will take
the position that it will pass on to the
commissioners all written material we've got
concerning the issuance of the fifth
license, but will not put anyone on the
agenda that wishes to speak beyond the
applicant and the county. Is that the
commission's desire?

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: I think so.

COMMISSIONER MILCAREK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay. If our counsel has another opinion, and that's brought to our attention, of course, we will

1 probably listen to her as we always do. So anything else under other business? 2 MR. THAR: 3 No. 4 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay. We have the next meeting scheduled for September 14th. 5 Mr. Coats has a question. 6 7 Does this mean that the MR. COATS: commission will no longer entertain any 8 9 opposition to riverboat gambling? CHAIRMAN VOWELS: 10 No. 11 COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: No, that's 12 not what it means. CHAIRMAN VOWELS: The next meeting 13 will be September 14th. We haven't decided 14 on just what time yet, have we? 15 16 That's correct. And it MR. THAR: 17 will be here. It will be in this 18 CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Okay. There's nothing else --19 room. COMMISSIONER SWAN: Wait, there's 20 Just as Other Business, Jack, it 21 one. occurred to me that these riverboats are 22 using a lot of computers in their business, 23 and I wonder if we've done anything to ask 24 them to affirmatively let us know that they 25

have all systems year 2000 compliant.

Because that can seriously affect their reporting to us and even their own operations. I would suggest that we ask them to make a statement like that to the commission.

MR. THAR: We will get our MIS department on that right away. And they have them provide us with that statement on September 14th meeting.

MR. COATS: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN VOWELS: You've rested.

Mr. Swan, is there anything further?

COMMISSIONER SWAN: No -- they may not be able to do that by September 14th. They have to get a series of tests to be able to prove themselves. But get the request out to the licensee, I think will be appropriate.

MR. THAR: I think for all practical purposes they all are. And already know that. But getting an affirmative statement is a good idea.

COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: Is our department, or is our staff up to date on

_	}
1	that?
2	MR. THAR: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER BOCHNOWSKI: Be
4	compliant?
5	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: All right. The
6	next thing on the agenda is to adjourn the
7	meeting. Is there a motion to adjourn?
8	COMMISSIONER SWAN: So move.
9	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: Second?
10	COMMISSIONER DARKO: Second it.
11	CHAIRMAN VOWELS: All those in favor
12	say aye.
13	(MOTION PASSED)
14	MEETING ADJOURNED.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	